## EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LEP

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

MAR 2 5 2005

FCC - MAILROOM

March 14, 2005

**ORIGINAL** 

1875 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006

Tel: 202 303 1000 Fax: 202 303 2000

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Ex Parte Notice

Re:

Implementation of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices, CS Dkt. No. 97-80

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On March 11, 2005, representatives of Comcast Corporation ("Comcast") met with Jordan Goldstein, Senior Legal Advisor to Commissioner Copps, and with Eric Bash, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Adelstein, to discuss the above-captioned proceeding. Comcast was represented by James Coltharp, Chief Policy Advisor, FCC & Regulatory Policy, and the undersigned.

At the outset, Comcast's representatives noted that the company continues to believe that the integration ban should be eliminated. Whatever the merits of the ban when it was adopted, subsequently changed circumstances (including but not limited to much improved relationships between cable operators and CE manufacturers and retailers, the intensification of video competition, and the successful introduction of CableCARDs) make it indefensible today. The integration ban intrudes more heavily upon the business decisions and practices of cable operators than is necessary to achieve the statutory objective. In addition, although the relevant statutory provision is one that applies equally to all multichannel video programming distributors, the integration ban inexplicably applies only to cable operators.

Recognizing that the Commission was not prepared to address those issues, Comcast previously advocated a deferral of the integration ban for 18 months, and more recently Comcast has accepted the notion of a 12-month postponement. In addition to these compromises. Comcast has also worked to reach agreement on several key issues with one company that previously was among the strongest proponents of the integration ban. At this juncture, the case for such an extension is compelling, and the arguments against it are unavailing.

As we discussed with Messrs. Goldstein and Bash, a deferral of the integration ban will not diminish the cable industry's commitment to promoting the retail availability of navigation devices. Even with the integration ban deferred, cable is and will remain subject to a requirement that it provide support for the current one-way, single-stream CableCARD

NEW YORK WASHINGTON, DC PARIS LONDON MILAN ROME FRANKFURT BRUSSELS

No. of Copies rec'd